



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,131	02/13/2002	Germano Caronni	06502.0356	5459

60667 7590 06/06/2006

SUN MICROSYSTEMS/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/073,131	Applicant(s) CARONNI ET AL.	
	Examiner Cam Y T. Truong	Art Unit 2162	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6-22,24-32,34-38 and 40-42.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE


8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

13. ☐ Other: _____.


 Cam Y Truong
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 2162

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued that the combination of Bauer and Kyne does not teach the claimed limitation "substituting the expandable sequence by at least one identifier identifying the requesting node, wherein the requesting node comprises a process".

In response to the applicant's argument, Bauer teaches "substituting the expandable sequence by at least one identifier identifying the requesting node" as substituting the pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding to the user's computer. This value is not a identifier identifying the user's computer. (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "at least one identifier identifying the requesting node; retrieving information corresponding to the expanded sequence".

Kyne teaches the text string identify a computer in a local network (fig. 4, col. 7, lines 10-12) and retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence (fig. 7, col. 9, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Kyne's teaching of the text string identify a computer in a local network and retrieving a web page corresponding to a URL as the expanded sequence to Bauer's system in order to reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store entry related to a user and further sending information request to a correct request computer.

Applicant argued that the combination of Bauer and Kyne does not teach the claimed limitation "substituting the expandable sequence by at least one identifier identifying the requesting node, wherein the requesting node comprises a process".

In response to applicant's argument, Bauer teaches "substituting the expandable sequence by at least one identifier identifying the requesting node" as substituting the pathname-home/jqp/ by a value such as Meeting.age or Meeting Agenda corresponding to the user's computer. This value is not a identifier identifying the user's computer. (figs. 3&7-8, col. 10, lines 1-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 9, lines 1-3);

"wherein the requesting node comprise a process" as a server receiving a user's request from the client computer to access file system having a list of file names. The above information shows that the client computer has included a process for sending the user's request to the server (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 30-67).

Bauer does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "at least one identifier identifying the requesting node; retrieving information corresponding to the expanded sequence".

Papierniak teaches a get request contains the IP address identifying the user computer on which the browser is being run and a URL and retrieving record based on a URL or a path (col. 4, lines 28-41).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Papierniak's teaching to Bauer's system in order to reduce the number of times a data entry is accessed in response to a single request to a user or a node and to provide identification information that is stored in a data store entry related to a user and further sending information request to a correct request computer.

For the above reason, examiner believed that the combinations of these arts teach the claimed invention.